

REMARKS

Claims 21-40 remain in this application.

Claims 21, 24, 31, and 33 have been amended.

Regarding the rejection of claims 24-26, and 33 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, the claims have been amended so as to overcome these rejections.

Regarding the rejection of claims 21, 24-30, 34, and 40 which is based on prior art, claim 21 has been amended to specify the use of two pumps, one of which precisely meters the raw fuel which goes to the evaporating device. And this pump is recited in claim 21 to be a “metering pump **whose rpm is regulated by means of the control unit (8)** so as to precisely meter the quantity of raw fuel which is delivered to the evaporating device.”

The examiner has pointed out that in column 3, lines 18-23 of Ruoff et al indicate that the pump (21) is controllable to provide sufficient fuel, but not oversupply fuel so that energy is not wasted. However, Ruoff et al has no teaching of a pump with the above features being controlled as specified in claim 21, see the above quote. And also Ruoff et al has no disclosure of a second pump. Thus clearly a rejection of the claims under 35 USC 102 is not appropriate.

The examiner has rejected claims 22 and 23 as unpatentable over Ruoff et al, saying that the recited manner of operating the pump does not carry patentable weight. But it is pointed out that claim 21 has been amended to incorporate language which specifically recites that the rpm of the pump is regulated by the control unit so that the output is precisely metered. This recitation in claim 21 already patentably defines definite structure over the reference to Ruoff et al, and claims 22 and 23 simply add even further limitations to this structure.

Appl. No. 10/509,058
Amdt. dated March 13, 2008
Reply to Office action of November 16, 2007

The examiner has also rejected claim 33 as unpatentable over Ruoff et al in view of McArthur. But again, McArthur does not supply the missing structural limitations as pointed out above for claim 21. Thus even McArthur cannot be combined with Ruoff et al to make these claims obvious to one skilled in the art.

And there are no other teachings of record, other than applicants' disclosure, which could in any way make the addition of a second pump to the structure of Ruoff et al obvious. Nor are there any teachings of record which could make the addition of control of the metering pump by the control unit obvious to one skilled in the art.


Moreover, it is pointed out that the structure which is now recited in claim 21, the structure which as pointed out above is not present in the prior art, is also the structure which allows this invention to gain the advantages as recited in the specification at paragraphs 13-18.

For all of the above reasons, taken singly or in combination with one other, entry of this amendment and allowance of the claims are courteously solicited.

Appl. No. 10/509,058
Amdt. dated March 13, 2008
Reply to Office action of November 16, 2007

The Commissioner is authorized to charge a fee of \$120.00, for a one month extension of time or any other necessary fees in connection with this communication, to Deposit Account Number 07-2100.

Respectfully submitted,



Ronald E. Greigg
Registration No. 31,517
Attorney of Record
CUSTOMER NO. 02119

GREIGG & GREIGG, P.L.L.C.
1423 Powhatan Street, Suite One
Alexandria, VA 22314

Tel. (703) 838-5500
Fax. (703) 838-5554

REG/SLS/ncr

J:\Bosch\R41000\Reply to 11-16-07 OA.wpd